

### REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

After entry of the foregoing amendment, claims 1-4 and 8-12 will be pending in the present application. Claims 1 and 11 have been amended and claim 12 has been added. Applicants are also filing formal drawings herewith.

In the Final Rejection dated June 11, 2003, the Examiner objected to claim 7 because it was dependent upon a rejected base claim but indicated that such claim would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicants have rewritten claim 1 to include the features of claim 7 and intervening claims 5 and 6. Consequently, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 and all claims dependent therefrom, including claims 2-4 and 8-10, are patentable, at least by their dependency, and respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of claims 1-4 and 8-10.

The Examiner rejected claim 11 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Devaux (of record). Applicants respectfully traverse such rejection. Applicants respectfully submit that claim 11, as amended, is patentable over the art of record for the following reasons. Claim 11 includes features that are neither taught nor suggested by the art of record. Namely, claim 11 has been amended to include "a ground plate disposed a predetermined distance from the transmission line elements wherein the predetermined distance is reflective of a *predetermined* characteristic impedance of the system."

Applicants respectfully submit that the Devaux reference fails to teach "a ground plate disposed a predetermined distance from the transmission line elements wherein the predetermined distance is reflective of a predetermined characteristic impedance of the system." The Examiner points to col. 1, ll. 32-37 as teaching "minimized disturbance of

propagation.” Applicants respectfully submit that the quoted portion of Devaux fails to teach or suggest the aforementioned feature of claim 11.

Devaux does teach at Col. 1, ll. 32-37 that the support (strip 2) is integrated with the impedance of the line. There is no mention anywhere in Devaux, however, that the ground plate is “disposed a predetermined distance from the transmission line elements wherein the predetermined distance is reflective of a predetermined characteristic impedance of the system.” In other words, Devaux teaches that the support contributes to the overall resulting impedance to the system. In contrast, claim 11 recites that the impedance of the system is predetermined and the distance between the transmission line elements and the ground plate is determined so that the resulting impedance is the predetermined impedance. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 11 is patentable over the cited art and respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 11.

Applicants have added new independent claim 12. Applicant respectfully submit that new claim 12 is also patentable over the cited art for the above mentioned reasons.

### CONCLUSION

For all the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that the pending claims patentably define over the cited art. Accordingly, a Notice of Allowance for claims 1-4 and 8-12 is respectfully requested. In the event, however, that the Examiner believes that the application is not allowable for any reason, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned attorney to discuss resolution of any remaining issues.

**DOCKET NO.:** FCI-2648/C3193  
**Application No.:** 10/015,985  
**Office Action Dated:** June 11, 2003

**PATENT  
REPLY FILED UNDER EXPEDITED  
PROCEDURE PURSUANT TO  
37 CFR § 1.116**

**Date:** October 1 , 2003



---

Erich M. Falke  
Registration No. 49,049

Woodcock Washburn LLP  
One Liberty Place - 46th Floor  
Philadelphia PA 19103  
Telephone: (215) 568-3100  
Facsimile: (215) 568-3439